Safety Advisory Committee
April 6, 2012
1:30 – 3:30 PM

Minutes

Committee Member	Representing	Present
Anderson, Erik	Materials Sciences Division	X
Bello, Madelyn	Human Resources Advisor	
Blodgett, Paul M.	Environment, Health and Safety Division	X
Cademartori, Helen	Information Technology Division	
Carithers, William	Physics Division	X
Christensen, John N.	Earth Sciences Division	X
Floyd, Jim	Safety Advisory Committee Chair	X
Franaszek, Stephen	Genomics Division	X
Fujikawa, Brian	Nuclear Science Division	X
Lukens Jr., Wayne W.	Chemical Sciences Division	X
Lunden, Melissa	Environmental Energy Technologies Division	X
Martin, Michael C.	Advanced Light Source Division	X
More, Anil V.	Office of the CFO Advisor	
Seidl, Peter	Accelerator & Fusion Research Division	X
Taylor, Scott E.	Life Sciences Division	X
Tucker, Eugene	Facilities Division	
Thomas, Patricia M.	Safety Advisory Committee Secretary	X
Walter, Howard	Computing Sciences Directorate	
Wong, Weyland	Engineering Division	X

Others Present: A. Andrews, James Basore, Michelle Flynn, Brandon DeFrancisci, Joe Dionne, Julie Henderson, Michael Kritscher, Jim Krupnick, Quang Le, Gita Meckel, Andrew Peterson, Rebecca Rishell, Randy Roig, Mike Ruggieri, Jack Salazar, Roshan Shadlou, Ann Tomaselli, Bill Wells

Comments from the Chair – Jim Floyd

- **AFRD Representative --** Peter Seidl is rejoining the Committee as the Accelerator and Fusion Research Division representative. He is the Division Deputy, Division Safety Coordinator, and a researcher in the fusion energy program.
- **Incident Analysis –** The most recent incident analysis charter was accepted by Paul Alivisatos. He has asked for some examples of good incident analyses. The incident analysis process should be integrated with the new causal analysis section of the issues management manual.

Medical Surveillance – Paul Blodgett

Paul Blodgett was speaking in behalf of Dr. Peter Lichty, who had a scheduling conflict. Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) Division is in the process of consolidating their information technology systems into a new Comprehensive Health, Environmental, and Safety System (CHESS). The first part to be released is for Health. Phase 2 of the medical surveillance system will interact with the Lab population. The intent is not to create new policy, but to improve tracking of implementation. Some medical surveillance, such as medical exams for forklift operators and respiratory protection, is mandatory because it is required by regulations. Some medical surveillance, such as asbestos and lead exposure, is required to be offered to employees; however, they may opt to decline it. LBNL needs to keep records of examinations that were performed or offered and declined. The old system required manual follow-up with telephone calls. The new system will send out automatic notifications and record electronic responses. Reports of non-confidential information will be available. Randy Roig will present the details at the Division Safety Coordinators' meeting next week.

The system is being updated to include all categories of animal care workers and nanoparticle workers. There will be some policy decisions in defining the worker population that SAC needs to evaluate.

There are internal milestones for developing and implementing CHESS. Peter Lichty is the "owner" of the medical examination program. The Subject Matter Experts in Industrial Hygiene help to define who should be in a medical surveillance group. The affected person and his/her supervisor will be notified when a new person is added to a group. Pre-employment selection is under discussion. There are about 4,600 person-groups to be tracked. The fact that a person is in a medical surveillance group or passed/failed an exam is not a confidential medical record; however, the details of the examinations are confidential. About 20-30% of the people affected are affiliates.

Work Release – Michelle Flynn and John Christensen

LBNL has been developing policies and process for releasing work in non-resident spaces. The Health, Safety, and Security (HSS) auditors recommended accelerating the schedule for Facilities workers. The objectives are to communicate the hazards in the spaces to non-resident workers, and to ensure the integrity of experiments and equipment inside spaces. Divisions are to identify areas requiring work release. The work releaser is responsible for communicating the hazards and determining whether a pre-job briefing is required. The non-resident worker communicates the scope of the work to be performed in the space, such as radiation monitoring or waste pick-up. Blanket releases can be established for routine tasks. Restrictions can be added to Work Orders or communicated through the supervisor. Divisions will have access to the database to update it. There will be an escalation feature, so if a releaser is

not available, an alternate will be contacted. Work release requirements should be limited to technical areas. The non-resident workers should describe the work in terms the customer can understand. In most cases, work releasers and area safety leaders will be the same people. There is an issue with terms such as matrixed employee/non-resident worker, work releaser/area safety lead, and work lead being used differently in different LBNL requirements. PUB-3000, Chapter 1 defines Area Safety Lead. It is being revised. A draft will be ready for the June meeting. The Facilities Division Director is officially responsible for maintaining software, procedures and other support tolls necessary for Facilities Division implementation of Technical Area Work Release; however, some duties may be delegated. The proposed work release system is going through the requirements management process.

Area PPE – Joe Dionne and Marty White

There will be a graded approach to establishing Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) requirements. High-risk areas will be under institutional requirements. Medium-risk area requirements will be determined by the Area Safety Lead with EHS review. Low-risk area requirements will be determined by Area Safety Leads. Risk levels are determined by relative compliance risk and hazard exposure. There was a question about work in multiple-use high bay areas, such as Bldg. 58. This would most likely be considered an incidental chemical use area. PPE would be required when chemicals are being used. It hasn't been decided who will make decisions about PPE for EHS – probably the Division Liaisons or Industrial Hygienists. The Area Safety Lead does not have to be part of the Line Management chain. Minimum PPE is defined in the Chemical Hygiene and Safety Manual.

The next steps are to align with EHS, the Division Safety Coordinators, and Division safety committees. The proposed changes will be discussed at "brown bag" meetings and in Today at Berkeley Lab articles. James Basore commented that the changes would affect EHS training. There was a comment that PPE signage needs to be uniform and visible. The definition of "area" is still somewhat vague.

Top 3 – Joe Dionne

Risk -- Joe Dionne asked for input on areas of risk that should be explored. There seemed to be a consensus that the inspection process for electrical equipment not approved by a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory would be a good place to start. Kem Robinson is officially the "authority having jurisdiction" for accepting electrical equipment. About 27,000 pieces of equipment have been inventoried, and about 400 were found to have safety issues. Many pieces of equipment were taken out of service. Replacing cords was the most frequent correction. Degraded cords may be better addressed

through safety walkthroughs. The inspection program appears to yield a low return on our investment in the program.
Mark Scott would like to look at setting priorities and having a graded approach. There may be other certifications we should consider accepting. There were comments that having a smooth process for inspecting house-built equipment would be the most valuable. There is some risk in not following the FCOG handbook. We need to look at the regulatory requirements – 10 CFR 851 and OSHA. Jim Floyd asked for volunteers from Materials Sciences, Energy and Environmental Technologies, Earth Sciences, and other affected Divisions to work with Joe Dionne on the issues.

Communications – EHS is continuing to send bulletins to the Divisions about the optimization efforts.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 PM
Respectfully submitted, Patricia M. Thomas, SAC Secretary